arXiv:1601.05739v2 [physics.class-ph] 14 Mar 2016

Radiative losses and radiation reaction derived from the kinetic power of the electric inertial mass of a charge

Ashok K. Singal

Astronomy and Astrophysics Division, Physical Research Laboratory, Navrangpura, Ahmedabad - 380 009, India

E-mail: asingal@prl.res.in

October 2015

Abstract. It is shown that formulas for radiative losses and radiation reaction from a charge can be derived from the kinetic power of its electric inertial mass. The derivation assumes a non-relativistic but otherwise an arbitrary motion of the charge. We exploit the fact that as the charge velocity changes because of a constant acceleration, there are accompanying modifications in its electromagnetic fields which can remain concurrent with the charge motion because the velocity as well as acceleration information enters into the field expression. However, if the acceleration of the charge is varying, information about that being not present in the field expressions, the electromagnetic fields get "out of step" with the actual charge motion. Accordingly we arrive at a radiation reaction formula for an arbitrarily moving charge, obtained hitherto in literature from the self-force, derived in a rather cumbersome way from the detailed mutual interaction between various constituents of a small charged sphere. This way we demonstrate that an irretrievable power loss from a charge occurs only when there is a change in its acceleration and the derived instantaneous power loss is directly proportional to the scalar product of the velocity and the rate of change of the acceleration of the charge.

PACS numbers: 03.50.De, 41.20.-q, 41.60.-m, 04.40.Nr

1. Introduction

The radiation reaction, first derived by Lorentz [1] from the self-force of a small charged sphere, is available in various forms in many text-books [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8]. The radiation reaction has hitherto been obtained in literature from the self-force of a small charged sphere, evaluated in a rather cumbersome way from the detailed mutual interaction between its constituents.

In these derivations one usually considers for the charge particle, a classical uniform spherical-shell model of radius r, which may be made vanishingly small in the limit. One calculates the force on each infinitesimal element of the charged sphere due to the fields from all its remainder parts, with the positions, velocities and accelerations of the latter

calculated at the retarded times. Then the net force on the charge is calculated by integration over the whole sphere. To make it simple, the force calculations are usually done in the instantaneous rest-frame of the charge where it is generally assumed that the motion of the charged varies slowly so that during the light-travel time across the particle, any changes in its velocity, acceleration and other higher time derivatives are relatively small. Then one can keep only linear terms $\mathbf{v}/c$, $\dot{\mathbf{v}}r/c^2$, $\ddot{\mathbf{v}}r^2/c^3$, etc., in the formulation of self-force, which turns out to be proportional to the rate of change of acceleration. Further the self-force turns out to be independent of the radius of the small sphere. One obtains the instantaneous radiative power loss formula by a scalar product of the self-force with the velocity of the charge.

However this power loss formula does not agree with the standard Larmor's formula, largely believed to be the correct formula for radiated power from an accelerated charge. There is extensive literature on this controversy of which of these two formulas gives correct description of radiative losses [9, 10, 11, 12]. Often an extra acceleration-dependent term called Schott energy is introduced to make them conform to each other [6, 13, 14, 15, 16]. More recently it has been shown that the two formulas are compatible and no controversy really arises if one keeps a proper distinction between the retarded time and the real time [17]. In particular, one gets Larmor's formula, with radiative losses proportional to the square of the acceleration if one expresses the radiated power in terms of quantities describing motion of the charge at the retarded time. On the other hand if the motion of the charge is expressed in terms of real time ("present") quantities, then one arrives at the power loss formula usually derived from the radiation reaction formulation, i.e., the radiative power loss proportional to the scalar product of the velocity and the first time derivative of the acceleration of the charge.

Without further entering into the controversy between the two radiation loss formulas we show here that one can derive the radiation reaction formula from the mechanical motion of the charge if one takes electrical mass of the charge as its inertial mass.

2. Electric inertial mass of a charge

From the volume integral of momentum density in electromagnetic fields of a charge moving with a non-relativistic *uniform* velocity $\mathbf{v}$, one arrives at a momentum $m_{el}\mathbf{v}$ with electric mass $m_{el} = 4U_0/3c^2$ [18], where $U_0 = e^2/2rc^2$ is the energy in self-fields of the charge in its rest frame (assuming a uniformly charged spherical shell of radius r). This factor of 4/3 in the inertia of electric mass has long since been highly annoysome, until it was explicitly shown that this extra factor in the expression for the total electromagnetic momentum of the charge arises because of the energy flow associated with the electromagnetic self-repulsion force within the charge constituents [19]. The net force on one hemisphere of the charge is along the direction of motion, and on the remaining hemisphere it is in a direction opposite to the motion. Therefore as the charge moves, a positive work is being done *on* the forward hemisphere, while an

equal amount of work is being done *by* the backward hemisphere. Though there is no net increase in the energy of the total system, but there is a continuous flow of energy across the charged sphere between its two halves, implying a corresponding momentum due to this energy-flow. This momentum is important even for non-relativistic velocities and in fact turns out to be 1/3rd of the otherwise momentum of the charge [19], thereby explaining this intriguing factor of 4/3 in the total electromagnetic momentum. In fact such contributions to energy-momentum of a charged system occur even in a macroscopic system like a charged capacitor and this fact was shown to provide a correct explanation of the null results of the famous Trouton-Noble experiment [20, 21].

3. Energy in the velocity-dependent self-fields of a moving charge

The total energy in electromagnetic fields, including both in velocity and acceleration fields, of a uniformly accelerated charge, has been shown to be at any given instant just equal to the self-energy of a non-accelerated charge moving with a uniform velocity equal to the instantaneous "present" velocity of the accelerated charge at that instant [22, 23]. It is shown that there is no excess energy in fields that could be treated as radiation, over and above that implied from the instantaneous "present" velocity of a uniformly accelerated charge. This argument was used to show the absence of radiation for a charge supported in a gravitational field [22, 23], in conformity with the strong principle of equivalence. It was Pauli [24] who first moted that magnetic filed $\mathbf{B} = 0$ throughout in the instantaneous rest-frame of a uniformly accelerated charge, and that there can be no radiation for such a motion.

The electromagnetic fields are determined by the position and motion of the charge at the retarded time t'. But Poynting theorem tells us that the rate of energy loss by charge at present time $t_{\rm o} = t' + r_{\rm o}/c$ (and not at retarded time t') is related to the instantaneous outgoing electromagnetic power (Poynting flux) at $t_{\rm o}$ from the spherical surface of radius $r_{\rm o}$, even though the fields at the surface are determined by the motion of the charge at the retarded time t'. This might appear to be a break down of causality, after all, how come the energy-loss rate of the charge at time $t_{\rm o}$ could be equated to the Poynting flux determined from the motion of the charge in past, i.e., at an earlier time t'? How can one be sure that the charge will not behave erratic between t' and $t_{\rm o}$, thus while keeping the Poynting flux unaffected (which depends upon charge motion at t') but modifying the kinetic power loss rate of the charge?

4. Derivation of radiative losses of a charge from mechanical considerations of its electric mass

Actually both the charge motion as well as the electromagnetic fields at the present time $t_{\rm o}$ are determined by the charge motion at t'. Both make use of the velocity and acceleration of the charge at t', and things in mechanics and electrodynamics are such that the power losses at a later time $t_{\rm o}(> t')$ remain synchronized from both for a

uniformly accelerated charge [22, 23]. The charge motion at t_o is determined by laws of mechanics,

$$\mathbf{v}_o = \mathbf{v} + \dot{\mathbf{v}}(t_o - t'), \tag{1}$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{v}}_o = \dot{\mathbf{v}}, \tag{2}$$

were $\mathbf{v}, \dot{\mathbf{v}}$ on the right hand side represent respectively the velocity and acceleration of the charge at the retarded time t', while $\mathbf{v}_o, \dot{\mathbf{v}}_o$ on the left hand side represent charge motion at the present time t_o.

The electromagnetic field at t_o, given by the laws of electrodynamics is also determined by the charge motion ($\mathbf{v}$ and $\dot{\mathbf{v}}$) at the retarded time t' [2, 25].

$$\mathbf{E}_o = \left[\frac{e(\mathbf{n} - \mathbf{v}/c)}{\gamma^2 r^2 (1 - \mathbf{n}\cdot\mathbf{v}/c)^3} + \frac{e\mathbf{n} \times \{(\mathbf{n} - \mathbf{v}/c) \times \dot{\mathbf{v}}\}}{rc^2\,(1 - \mathbf{n}\cdot\mathbf{v}/c)^3} \right]_{t'}, \tag{3}$$

It is well known that the self-field energy of a charge moving with a uniform velocity is different for different values of the velocity (see e.g., ref. [19]). Let us now consider the case of a uniform acceleration where $\dot{\mathbf{v}}_o = \dot{\mathbf{v}}_{t'}$. Due to the acceleration, the velocity changes and from detailed analytical calculations it has indeed been shown [22, 23] that for a uniformly accelerated charge, total energy in the fields (i.e., including both velocity and acceleration field terms from Eq. (3)) at any time is just equal to the self-energy of a charge moving uniformly with a velocity equal to the instantaneous "present" velocity of the accelerated charge (even though the detailed field configurations may differ in the two cases). Thus when a charge is uniformly accelerated and it gains speed, the energy in its self-fields increases. For a uniform acceleration, this contribution to the total field energy of the charge is just sufficient to match exactly the amount needed for its velocity-dependent self-field energy based on its extrapolated motion at a future time. This is possible because the information about both the velocity and acceleration of the charge is present in the field expressions (Eq. (3)), and as long as the charge continues to move with acceleration *equal to that at the retarded time* (i.e., a uniform acceleration) no mismatch in field energy takes place. However, a mismatch in the field energy with respect to the self-Coulomb field energy of the charge occurs when charge moves with a non-uniform acceleration since there is no information in the field expressions about the rate of change of acceleration of the charge. In that case the "real" velocity of the charge differs from the extrapolated value obtained from the value of acceleration at the retarded time and the energy in the actual velocity fields no longer agrees with that based on fields determined by the acceleration at the retarded time. Then the total field energy does not correspond to that in self-field due to the "real" velocity of the charge, and it is this difference in the field energy that could be said to be irretrievably lost into radiation.

We consider a charge moving initially with a uniform acceleration $\dot{\mathbf{v}}$ and at some time t' a rate of change of acceleration, $\ddot{\mathbf{v}}$, is imposed on the charge motion. For simplicity we assume that the charge was moving with a small non-relativistic velocity $\mathbf{v}$ at time t'. Now at time $t_o = t' + r_o/c$ the information about the change in acceleration has

not yet gone beyond r_o, therefore the electromagnetic fields and the energy-momentum in them outside the charge radius r_o is unaffected by the imposition of $\ddot{\mathbf{v}}$ on the charge motion at t'. Therefore the electromagnetic energy-momentum in fields external to the charge continues at t_o to be that of a uniformly accelerated charge, and thus determined from $\mathbf{v}$ and $\dot{\mathbf{v}}$ at t'. The energy in fields mimics the extrapolated value of the kinetic energy of the charge (with electric mass of the charge taken as its inertial mass) for its erstwhile uniform acceleration [18]. However, due to a change in the acceleration, the kinetic energy of the charge is no longer that extraplated from its acceleration at t'. And it is this difference in energy that can be thought as detached from the actual charge motion (as it is not accounted in its self-fields) and thus can be thought to have been radiated away. Therefore a "mismatch" in the electromagnetic field energy and the kinetic energy of the charge would occur if there is a finite rate of change of acceleration, $\ddot{\mathbf{v}}$. From this one expects that a direct comparison of the charge motion with and without a rate of change of acceleration should be able to yield the excess power going into the fields than what demanded by the actual "present" motion of the charge. Thus by comparing the change in the mechanical power between the two cases (i.e., uniform acceleration and non-uniform acceleration cases), one should be able to calculate the excess power going into the fields. Of course in order to relate the mechanical to the electromagnetic power, one has to employ the electrical mass $m_{el} = 2e^2/3r_oc^2$ of a charge [18, 19].

Laws of mechanics determine the actual charge motion at t_o taking $\ddot{\mathbf{v}}$ also into consideration,

$$\mathbf{v}_o = \mathbf{v} + \dot{\mathbf{v}}(t_o - t') + \frac{\ddot{\mathbf{v}}(t_o - t')^2}{2}, \tag{4}$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{v}}_o = \dot{\mathbf{v}} + \ddot{\mathbf{v}}(t_o - t'). \tag{5}$$

There is no equivalent provision in the equations of electrodynamics and the fields do not take into consideration any rate of change of acceleration (viz. Eq. (3)). For a finite $\ddot{\mathbf{v}}$, the velocity (and thereby kinetic energy) of charge at t_o will be different, meaning charge would have different kinetic energy than what went into its electromagnetic fields, the latter not taking $\ddot{\mathbf{v}}$ into account.

The expression for the kinetic power is,

$$P = \mathrm{d}(m_{el}\mathbf{v}_o^2/2)/\mathrm{d}t = m_{el}\dot{\mathbf{v}}_o \cdot \mathbf{v}_o. \tag{6}$$

which for a uniform acceleration case ($\ddot{\mathbf{v}}_o = 0$) from Eqs. (1) and (2) is,

$$P_1 = m_{el}\dot{\mathbf{v}} \cdot \Big[\mathbf{v} + \dot{\mathbf{v}}(t_o - t')\Big]. \tag{7}$$

As we discussed above, for a uniform acceleration case this is also the power going into the changing electromagnetic fields of the charge. However, the expression for the power going into the kinetic energy of the charge in a non-uniform acceleration case ($\dot{\mathbf{v}}_o \neq 0$), from Eqs. (4) and (5) is,

$$P_2 = m_{el}\Big[\dot{\mathbf{v}} + \ddot{\mathbf{v}}(t_o - t')\Big] \cdot \Big[\mathbf{v} + \dot{\mathbf{v}}(t_o - t') + \frac{\ddot{\mathbf{v}}(t_o - t')^2}{2}\Big]. \tag{8}$$

But this is not the power going into the changing electromagnetic fields of the charge, which involves exactly the value of $\dot{\mathbf{v}}_\mathrm{o}$ at t' and is still given by P_1 (Eq. (7)). The excess rate of power, ΔP, going into the fields over and above the actual kinetic power of the charge $(P_1 - P_2)$ then is,

$$\Delta P = m_{el}\dot{\mathbf{v}} \cdot \Big[\mathbf{v} + \dot{\mathbf{v}}(t_\mathrm{o} - t')\Big] - m_{el}\Big[\dot{\mathbf{v}} + \ddot{\mathbf{v}}(t_\mathrm{o} - t')\Big] \cdot \Big[\mathbf{v} + \dot{\mathbf{v}}(t_\mathrm{o} - t') + \frac{\ddot{\mathbf{v}}(t_\mathrm{o} - t')^2}{2}\Big], \tag{9}$$

which to the lowest order in $t_\mathrm{o} - t'$ $(= r_\mathrm{o}/c)$ is

$$\Delta P = -m_{el}\ddot{\mathbf{v}} \cdot \mathbf{v}_\mathrm{o}(r_\mathrm{o}/c). \tag{10}$$

Substituting for the electric mass of a charge, $m_{el} = 2e^2/3r_\mathrm{o}c^2$, the excess power in the electromagnetic fields is,

$$\Delta P = -\frac{2e^2}{3r_\mathrm{o}c^2}\ddot{\mathbf{v}} \cdot \mathbf{v}_\mathrm{o}\frac{r_\mathrm{o}}{c} = \frac{-2e^2\ddot{\mathbf{v}} \cdot \mathbf{v}_\mathrm{o}}{3c^3}. \tag{11}$$

This is the formula for power losses from a radiating charge.

We can write this power loss being due to a radiative drag force $\mathbf{F}$ as the charge moves with a velocity $\mathbf{v}_\mathrm{o}$.

$$\Delta P = -\mathbf{F} \cdot \mathbf{v}_\mathrm{o} = \frac{-2e^2\ddot{\mathbf{v}} \cdot \mathbf{v}_\mathrm{o}}{3c^3}. \tag{12}$$

or

$$\left[\mathbf{F} - \frac{2e^2\ddot{\mathbf{v}}}{3c^3}\right] \cdot \mathbf{v}_\mathrm{o} = 0. \tag{13}$$

Since in Eq. (13) $\mathbf{v}_\mathrm{o}$ is an arbitrary vector, implying that the equation is true for all values of $\mathbf{v}_\mathrm{o}$, we have

$$\mathbf{F} = \frac{2e^2\ddot{\mathbf{v}}}{3c^3}. \tag{14}$$

This is the equation of radiative drag force or radiation reaction, derived in literature from the self-force of a charged sphere.

We have thus derived radiation reaction and the radiative losses from the kinetic power of the electric inertial mass of a charged particle. This novel approach allowed us, in a few simple and easy mathematical steps, to arrive at radiative power-loss formula, obtained hitherto in literature from very lengthy and tedious calculations of the self-force of a charged sphere. It demonstrated in a succinct manner the basic soundness of the assertion that the radiation losses result from a non-uniform acceleration of the charged system. But even more important, it provides us a totally different physical outlook on the energy-momentum conservation relation between electromagnetic and mechanical phenomena in classical electrodynamics.

5. Conclusions

From mechanical considerations of electric inertial mass of a charge formulas, for radiation reaction and the radiative losses were derived. The derivation made use of the fact that,

1. A moving charge has a electromagnetic field momentum which we can infer from classical mechanics if one uses its electric inertial mass.

2. In the case of a uniformly accelerated charge, its rate of change in kinetic energy is concurrent with the rate of change in its electromagnetic field energy, and is given by the scalar product of its instantaneous velocity with the rate of change of its electromagnetic momentum.

3. In the case of a varying acceleration, the energy in the electromagnetic fields changes at a different rate than the rate of change of kinetic energy of the charge and it is this energy difference that is not represented in the actual motion of the charge and is thus effectively detached from it can be called as radiated away.

The accordingly derived instantaneous power loss turns out to be directly proportional to the scalar product of the velocity and the rate of change of acceleration of the charge as derived earlier in literature from radiation reaction due to the self-force of the charge.

References

[1] Lorentz H A 1909 *The theory of electron* (Leipzig: Teubner) Reprinted 1952 2nd ed (New York: Dover)
[2] Jackson J D 1975 *Classical electrodynamics* 2nd ed (New York: Wiley)
[3] Panofsky W K H and Phillips M 1962 *Classical electricity and magnetism* 2nd ed (Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley)
[4] Heitler W 1954 *The quantum theory of radiation* (Clarendon: Oxford)
[5] Griffiths D J 1999 *Introduction to electrodynamics* 3rd ed (New Jersey: Prentice)
[6] Schott G A 1912 *Electromagnetic radiation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
[7] Page L and Adams Jr N I 1940 *Electrodynamics* (New York: Van Nostrand).
[8] Yaghjian A D 2006 *Relativistic Dynamics of a charged sphere* 2nd ed (New York: Springer)
[9] Teitelboim C 1970 Splitting of the Maxwell tensor: radiation reaction without advanced fields *Phys. Rev. D* **1** 1572-1582
[10] Templin J D 1998 An approximate method for the direct calculation of radiation reaction, *Am. J. Phys.* **66** 403-409
[11] Rohrlich F 1997 The dynamics of a charged sphere and the electron *Am. J. Phys.* **65** 1051-1056
[12] Hammond R T 2010 Relativistic particle motion and radiation reaction in electrodynamics *El. J. Theor. Phys.* **23** 221-258
[13] Grøn ø 2012 Electrodynamics of radiating charges *Adv. Math. Phys.* **2012**, 528631, 1-29
[14] Heras J A and O'Connell R F 2006 Generalization of the Schott energy in electrodynamic radiation theory *Am. J. Phys.* **74** 150-153
[15] Grøn ø 2011 The significance of the Schott energy for energy-momentum conservation of a radiating charge obeying the Lorentz–Abraham–Dirac equation *Am. J. Phys.* **79** 115-122
[16] Steane A M 2015 Tracking the radiation reaction energy when charged bodies accelerate *Am. J. Phys.* **83** 703-710

[17] Singal A K 2016 Compatibility of Larmor's formula with radiation reaction for an accelerated charge *Found. Phys.* **46** 554-574 DOI: 10.1007/s10701-015-9978-2
[18] Feynman R P Leighton R B and Sands M 1964 *The Feynman lectures on physics* Vol. II (Mass: Addison-Wesley)
[19] Singal A K 1992 Energy-momentum of the self-fields of a moving charge in classical electromagnetism *J. Phys. A* **25** 1605-1620
[20] Singal A K 1993 On the "explanation" of the null results of Trouton-Noble experiment *Am. J. Phys.* **61** 428-433
[21] Trouton F T and Noble, H R 1903 The mechanical forces acting on a charged electric condenser moving through space *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. London A* **202** 165-181.
[22] Singal A K 1995 The equivalence principle and an electric charge in a gravitational field *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **27** 953-967.
[23] Singal A K 1997 The equivalence principle and an electric charge in a gravitational field II. A uniformly accelerated charge does not radiate *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **29** 1371-1390
[24] W. Pauli, Relativitätstheorie in *Encyklopadie der Matematischen Wissenschaften*, V 19 (Teubner, Leipzig, 1921). Translated as *Theory of relativity* (Pergamon, London, 1958).
[25] Singal A K 2011 A first principles derivation of the electromagnetic fields of a point charge in arbitrary motion *Am. J. Phys.* **70** 1036-1041